

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/618,635	MOELLER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Devona E. Faulk	2644	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Devona E. Faulk. (3) Gary D. Yucura.  
 (2) Corey Chau. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: \_\_\_\_.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: \_\_\_\_.

Identification of prior art discussed: Orfield and Anderson.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant has three applications pending having similar subject matter, 10/646734, 09/791802 and 10/618635. Mr. Yacura explained what the invention was and its novelty over what is presently being done, went through each application and went through some proposed amendments for some of the claims. Both examiners indicated that the claims as recited currently for their cases were not allowable. The applicant's representative indicated that he would be possibly sending some proposed amendments to Corey Chau and would enlist some feedback as to if those claims would at least overcome the prior art.